



BULLETIN

OF

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESSES
LIST OF COMMITTEES

PUBLISHED BY
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS
225 CHURCH STREET, EASTON, PA.

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 222 CHARLES RIVER ROAD
CAMBRIDGE
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

General Announcements

American University Union in Europe.....	3
European Travel for American College Students.....	3
Pan-American Union.....	4
National Research Council.....	4
Doctorates in American Universities.....	5
Educational Boards and Foundations.....	5
School Statistics, 1870-1920.....	5
The Teaching of Evolution.....	6
American Association for the Advancement of Science.....	7

Recent Educational Discussion

Dry-Rot of Our Academic Biology, <i>W. M. Wheeler</i>	8
Progressive Adjustment vs. Entrance Elimination, <i>C. E. Seashore</i>	10
Participation of the Federal Government in Education, <i>Committee U. S. Chamber of Commerce</i>	12
New Standards of College Work.....	16
The University and the Nation, <i>W. E. Dodds</i>	16

Presidential Addresses

American University Education, <i>S. P. Capen</i>	25
Inaugural Address, <i>Marion E. Park</i>	29
The Purposes of the University, <i>J. G. Bowman</i>	33
Responsibility of the Community to the University, <i>L. D. Coffman</i>	35
The Unity of the Curriculum, <i>A. Meiklejohn</i>	36
The Undergraduate Course, <i>M. L. Burton</i>	37
The Reconstruction of Democracy, <i>G. B. Cutten</i>	38
Junior College Movement in Missouri, <i>J. C. Jones</i>	39

Local and Chapter Notes

University of Pennsylvania, President and Provost.....	40
--	----

Committee Note

Committee G.....	41
------------------	----

Committees for 1923.....	42
--------------------------	----

Membership

Members Elected.....	48
Nominations for Membership.....	49

GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY UNION IN EUROPE.—The Bulletin for January, 1923 contains a special report of overseas work of the Union, by Professor G. H. Nettleton, reading in part as follows:

"Statistics of Growth.—Definite proof of the rapid growth of the service of the Union to American students in France is given by statistics from the Paris office. From 61 students regularly registered in November, 1919, the number rose to 257 in June, 1920, and 472 in January, 1921. For the calendar year beginning March 15, 1921, the total reached the impressive number of 1,348 students, representing 174 American educational institutions, and 46 states and the District of Columbia. These students were distributed among 49 different French institutions, including 16 of the 17 provincial universities and a wide range of other representative institutions. Equally significant is the fact that the service of the Union is now fairly evenly divided between women and men students. Of the total 1,348, 632 were women and 716 men."

This is followed by the annual reports of the Directors of the Continental and British Divisions, the former containing a list of fellowships for Americans in Europe and a list of fellowships and scholarships for Europeans in the United States. The report itself contains an account of the development of French studies in the United States and of summer schools in France. The British report discusses facilities for advanced study and research, cooperation with British universities, cooperation with ancillary universities and other bodies, interchange of students in lectures, application of immigration laws to students, pseudo-American universities and traffic in degrees, and touring parties of collegians.

EUROPEAN TRAVEL FOR AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS.—The Institute of International Education has given its official sponsorship to a group of three tours to European countries which have been organized for the coming summer for the benefit of students and instructors in American colleges and universities.

The tours include a Students' Tour to France, carrying the special auspices of the Fédération de l'Alliance Française in addition to the

auspices of the Institute, a Students' Tour to Italy, which also carries the auspices of the Italy-America Society, and an Art Students' Tour.

The Students' Tours are an outgrowth of the Students' Tour to Italy in 1921, which had as its special and immediate purpose the sending of a group of American students to represent the institutions of learning of the United States in the ceremonies to commemorate the six-hundredth anniversary of the death of Dante, which Italy and all the world celebrated in 1921.

It is the hope and purpose of the Board of Advisors that the movement may be still further extended in coming years, and that from year to year young Americans in increasing numbers may take advantage of the opportunities thus offered to travel abroad on errands of friendship, determined to learn rather than to teach, but carrying with them a full sense of our American standards, principles, and purposes.

Correspondence may be addressed to Mr. Irwin Smith, 30 East 42nd Street, New York City.

PAN-AMERICAN UNION, SECTION OF EDUCATION.—A report just submitted by the Assistant Director in charge of this section gives an account of the study of Spanish and Portuguese at colleges and universities in the United States, and expresses the desire of the Director to be of service in connection with inquiries from Latin Americans desiring to study in the United States.

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL.—The Division of Educational Relations, of which Dr. Vernon Kellogg is chairman, is planning to send out during the next few weeks copies of Dr. Seashore's Open Letter to College Seniors, and reprints of his address on "The Gifted Student and Research" with copies of comments on his earlier paper, "Sectioning Classes."

The Division is also taking steps to prepare a new series of papers on opportunities for research in various branches for distribution. The Chairman of the Division and President Aydelotte of Swarthmore College are now engaged in the preparation of a somewhat detailed report on the present status of honor systems in American colleges and universities.

DOCTORATES IN AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES.—*School and Society* for January 20 contains a list of doctorates conferred in the arts and sciences by American universities, 1921-22. The statistical tables review the record for the past ten years showing a total of 442 in the sciences (1922), 297 in the arts. In the former list the University of Chicago has a long lead with 61; in the latter Columbia leads with 50. If the figures are combined, Chicago has 96, Columbia 81.

EDUCATIONAL BOARDS AND FOUNDATIONS.—The U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1922, No. 38, reviews the work of the General Education Board, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation and certain other funds less directly related to higher education for the years 1920-1922. The General Education Board, up to July 1, 1921, had appropriated more than \$88,000,000 for various phases of educational work and for the year ending June 30, 1921, more than \$33,000,000, of which \$18,000,000 was for universities and colleges. The balance of the unappropriated principal, June 30, 1921, was more than \$86,000,000. For the past two years the activities of the General Education Board in the field of college and university education have been principally concerned with the distribution of Mr. Rockefeller's special gift of \$50,000,000 to aid in the increase of teachers' salaries. The activities of the Rockefeller Foundation during the past two years have been mainly in the field of medical education and hospital work.

SCHOOL STATISTICS, 1870-1920.—United States Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1922, No. 29, contains statistics of State School Systems. In Table 1, the enrollment is given for elementary and secondary schools, combined, by decades from 1870 to 1920, showing the extraordinary increase from 80,000 to 2,199,000. During the same period, the men teachers increased from 77,500 to 95,600; the women teachers from 123,000 to 583,600; the value of school property from \$130,000,000 to \$2,400,000,000. The percentage of pupils in all schools, after a slight decline in the first decade, increased from 1.1 to 10.2. The percentage of men teachers, after an increase from 41.0 in 1870 to 42.8 in 1880, has steadily declined to 14.1 in 1920. The average annual salary of all teachers has steadily advanced from \$189 in 1870 to \$871 in 1920.

THE TEACHING OF EVOLUTION.—“The council of the American Association for the Advancement of Science adopted at its meeting on December 26, the following resolution:

Inasmuch as the attempt has been made in several states to prohibit in tax-supported institutions the teaching of evolution as applied to man, and

Since it has been asserted that there is not a fact in the universe in support of this theory, that it is a ‘mere guess’ which leading scientists are now abandoning, and that even the American Association for the Advancement of Science at its last meeting in Toronto, Canada, approved this revolt against evolution, and

Inasmuch as such statements have been given wide publicity through the press and are misleading public opinion on this subject, therefore,

The Council of the American Association for the Advancement of Science has thought it advisable to take formal action upon this matter, in order that there may be no ground for misunderstanding of the attitude of the association, which is one of the largest scientific bodies in the world, with a membership of more than 11,000 persons, including the American authorities in all branches of science. The following statements represent the position of the council with regard to the theory of evolution.

1. The council of the association affirms that, so far as the scientific evidences of the evolution of plants and animals and man are concerned, there is no ground whatever for the assertion that these evidences constitute a ‘mere guess.’ No scientific generalization is more strongly supported by thoroughly tested evidences than is that of organic evolution.

2. The council of the association affirms that the evidences in favor of the evolution of man are sufficient to convince every scientist of note in the world. These evidences are increasing in number and importance every year.

3. The council also affirms that the theory of evolution is one of the most potent of the great influences for good that have thus far entered into human experience; it has promoted the progress of knowledge, it has fostered unprejudiced inquiry, and it has served as an invaluable aid in humanity’s search for truth in many fields.

4. The council of the association is convinced that any legislation attempting to limit the teaching of any scientific doctrine so well established and so widely accepted by specialists as is the doctrine of evolution, would be a profound mistake, which could not fail to injure and retard the advancement of knowledge and of human welfare, by denying the freedom of teaching and inquiry which is essential to all progress.”

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE.
—A special meeting of the Association with the Pacific Division
and the Southern Division will be held at Los Angeles, September
17 and 19.

RECENT EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION

THE DRY-ROT OF OUR ACADEMIC BIOLOGY.—“Undoubtedly the best culture medium for the academic dry-rot fungus consists of about equal parts of narrow, unsympathetic specialization and normal or precocious senile abstraction, and as this medium is always present in many personalities that find their optimum environment in our universities, the outlook is depressing. A friend who has long been studying our institutions of learning maintains that our only salvation lies in discharging all our faculties and burning or thoroughly disinfecting all the buildings every twenty-five years. I am somewhat less pessimistic, for although I have seen very little improvement in pedagogical method in our biological departments during the past thirty-five years, the stress they have laid on research has preserved them from the hopeless mummification that has overtaken some of the other departments. . . .

“Not only do many of us wear out our most valuable tissues converting the graduate students into mere vehicles of our own interests, prepossessions and specialties but nearly all of us fail to excite in them that spirit of adventure which has in the past yielded such remarkable results in the development of our science. The finest example of this lack of vision is seen in the stolid indifference, especially in our eastern universities, to exploration and research in the remote portions of our own country, in foreign lands and especially in the tropics. We have in the Philippines and at our very doors in the West Indies, Mexico, Central and South America the most marvelous faunas and floras in the world, but we still persuade our traveling fellows to cut more sections in the laboratories of Professor Rindskopf of Berlin or Professor Himmelschwanz of Leipzig, because thirty or forty years ago we were sent to the same *bemooste Häupter*. There was then a certain justification for this procedure because we at least picked up much valuable information from our fellow students in the *Bierstube*. But what shall we say to such dry-rot exhibitions as the following?—A few years ago I was asked to secure a young botanist to accompany a biological expedition to the little known Solomon Islands and therefore begged one of our eminent *exsiccati* to aid me in the quest. To my amazement he actually asked me whether I did not know that New England was covered with a luxuriant and almost unknown

flora and did not regard it as a crime to dissuade a young botanist from devoting his life to pressing the plants of Cape Cod! And yet the theory which has revolutionized all our thinking was brought to us from the tropics by two naturalist explorers, and for a century those who have presided over higher education in Great Britain, France, Germany and the Scandinavian countries have seized every opportunity to send their young biologists to the tropics. I refrain from wearying you with the long list of gifted European naturalists who, just before the war and throughout the tropics of both hemispheres, were increasing our biological knowledge by leaps and bounds. The neglect of our splendid opportunities has, in fact, become such a scandal that it is known even to our august band of Delphic hierodules¹ in crinolines, the National Research Council.

"When we leave the advanced student and turn to the beginner, the picture is even more depressing. To us gerontic schoolmarms in trousers, who have flown from reality and have slowly succumbed to autistic thinking, with defective eye-sight, doughy musculature, brittle ossifications, demoralized intestines, decayed autonomic nervous systems and atrophied interstitials, there comes every year a small army of freshmen—very properly so called—in the late teens and early twenties, burning for impact with reality, with exquisite sense-organs, superb bones, muscles and alimentary tracts, mirific endocrine and autonomic apparatus and a mentality of nine to fourteen years, or thereabouts—and what do we give them? Perhaps we give them what they deserve for coming to us, but it might be more charitable to discuss what we do not give them. What portion of the science of life, that most concrete and most entrancing of all the sciences, ought we to administer to this suckling host of post-adolescents? I answer: they should be fed during the first year on the simple oat-meal pap of ecology, but I hasten to declare that I do not mean the "ecology" of the zoologists, and especially of the botanists, of what Mencken calls the silo and saleratus belt of our great republic....

"We should all be happier if we were less completely obsessed by problems and somewhat more accessible to the esthetic and emotional appeal of our materials, and it is doubtful whether, in the end, the

¹ The definition of "hierodule" in the Century Dictionary is followed by the remark: "Large numbers of such slaves were attached to some foundations, and were either employed about the sanctuary or let out for hire for the profit of the god."

growth of biological science would be appreciably retarded. It quite saddens me to think that when I cross the Styx, I may find myself among so many professional biologists, condemned to keep on trying to solve problems, and that Pluto, or whoever is in charge down there now, may condemn me to sit forever trying to identify specimens from my own specific and generic diagnoses, while the amateur entomologists, who have not been damned professors, are permitted to roam at will among the fragrant asphodels of the Elysian meadows, netting gorgeous, ghostly butterflies until the end of time."

WILLIAM MORTON WHEELER, in *Science*.

PROGRESSIVE ADJUSTMENT VERSUS ENTRANCE ELIMINATION IN A STATE UNIVERSITY.—Students presenting character defects in terms of analyzed records should be interviewed systematically and constructively by the personnel staff and provision should be made for the noting of evidence of their successful readjustments or continued failures. The university must interest itself in other forms of character defects than cheating and should make varied provisions in the socialization of the group for the recognition and cultivation of character through self-expression in college life.

Thus we shall have in the junior college, and particularly in the freshman class, a sort of socializing melting-pot in which the student, under most favorable conditions, discovers his natural level of successful achievement, finds the best provision for his particular level, is encouraged to live at his maximum capacity for achievement, and is praised and blamed fairly and intelligently on the basis of the relation of his achievement to his capacity for achievement.

To furnish at this level a natural and dignified stopping-place for those who here reach their natural limits, ample practical courses should be provided in these years, as finishing courses, fitting the student for commerce, industry, civil service, social, home, and other situations. These should be two-year courses leading to a certificate.

"The absence of practical courses in the junior college is today the most conspicuous gap in our educational system. The policy of offering practical courses of this kind in the high school was settled permanently fifteen or twenty years ago, and there is today no first-class high school without them. Within the last fifteen or twenty years semi-professional courses have found recognition in the undergraduate college, the professional work being given in the junior and

senior years; and I see no evidence of decline in that tendency. But between the high school and the senior college we have left a gap of a clean-cut period of two years in which no landing facilities for the practical-minded student are offered. This gross omission is due in large part to the traditional feeling on the part of academic men that, since the four-year course is good for one student, it is good for another. This, I maintain, is unsound; it represents ignorance of the significance of individual differences. It is due also in part to ignorance and misconception as to what constitutes a practical course where well organized. . . .

"Summing up, then, the provisions of this plan are (1) the establishing of a system of student analysis in the high school, (2) the organization of a technical personnel service in the dean's office for undergraduates, (3) the organization of diagnostic examinations at the opening of each freshman course, (4) the progressive segregation into sections on the basis of ability and willingness to work, and (5) provision for practical courses which may be completed at any of the two-year levels.

"There is nothing radically new in these propositions, as each of the provisions recommended is now in operation in some institution. It is, however, easy to anticipate some objections that will be raised. Among these will be the objection to the extension of practical courses under liberal admission. My defense is that I ask only for such provision as will enable the student to fit himself best for citizenship at the level of higher education which he can reach. This leaves large latitude for the interpretation of what is practical and most valuable for citizenship and economic independence. From the point of view of the protection of the institution, this provision will serve to encourage for the liberal courses those who are best qualified to pursue such courses and will therefore strengthen higher education.

"There will also always be those who object to any form of inventory of the individual. Such persons cannot be converted by argument; it is simply a matter of getting used to it. Personnel analysis has come to stay in school as well as in industry.

"There will, perhaps, be some opposition to the introduction of the personnel service into academic life. This objection comes largely from those who objected to the introduction of deans and may possibly take the same course.

"There are also those who have serious doubt as to the wisdom of attempting to get homogeneous groups for the purpose of instruction. To this I can say that a recent survey made by the Division of Educational Relations in the National Research Council shows that not one of the colleges and universities that has given this method a serious trial has given it up on the ground that it was undesirable.

"The man who fought to the last ditch for the hard shell education as the only higher education worth while is still in evidence and exclaims, "What has become of liberal education?" The answer is that it has become more liberal."

C. E. SEASHORE, in *School and Society*.

PARTICIPATION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN EDUCATION.—A commission of the United States Chamber of Commerce, under the chairmanship of Mr. J. J. Storrow of Boston, has just published a majority report as a basis for a referendum on the subject of "Participation of the Federal Government in Education" and the correlation of educational work of the Federal government to its other activities. The report is essentially a strong and thoroughly worked out argument against the provisions of the Sterling-Towner Bill which has recently been supported by the National Educational Association, the American Federation of Labor, and others. The following extracts may indicate its general character:

"Great is the danger of handing the power of controlling the ideas and ideals of the growing generation to a group of bureaucrats located far away at the seat of government.

"They may wilfully do great damage. They may unwittingly sow seeds on a nation-wide scale which will fructify only after many quiet years of germination so that the noxious weeds can perhaps be eradicated only by the slow growth of public reaction after grievous injury to our body politic. . . .

"The genius of our people should and must control our schools. There is nowhere else to place this trust. But if our people are to control our schools and to cause them to be sensitive to their ideals, to their varying needs from year to year and from locality to locality, those in charge must be near them, accessible to them, and responsive to them. A vote once in two or six years for a member of Congress or a Senator who is to live at the seat of government far from home,

and who must be elected to attend to a hundred other things and can therefore rarely be elected on an educational issue, coupled with the rigidity which would almost certainly be attained by the managing bureaucracy at Washington, would make our school system about as sensitive and responsive to the average man as a ton of pig iron to a tack hammer. . . .

"Moreover, if our government is to survive, if these 100,000,000 people, soon to become 200,000,000 people, made up of racial stocks from many countries, embodying many varying degrees and forms of civilization and of governing knowledge or rather lack of knowledge of self-government, are to succeed in maintaining and carrying on this great Federal democracy, it will only be by the constant practice of local self-government in things which vitally concern them. . . .

"There have now been inserted in the bill, however, specific words stating in effect that the Federal Government shall not interfere or endeavor to control the expenditure of the money which it is to turn over to the states.

"Apart from the fundamentally unsound policy of having *A* levy the taxes, collect the funds, and then wash his hands of all responsibility for the expenditure of funds by *B*, it only takes, we think, a moderate experience in affairs to realize that people are bound to be sensitive to the views of the dispenser of their annual largesses even though his wishes are not embodied in words of command but are conveyed in terms of suggestion and recommendation.

"But right at the outset and on the face of the bill, its proponents are trying to sit on both sides of the fence at the same time, as another part of the bill sets up certain standards which the states must meet and maintain if they are to receive Federal money and the new Cabinet officer, the Secretary of Education created by the bill, is given authority to withhold the money from any state which fails to meet the standards.

"But really common sense is sufficient without argument to tell us that if the six hundred thousand teachers of this country find themselves on the Federal payroll, they are going in the long run to be subject at least to a dual influence and a dual control. . . . Moreover the proponents of the Sterling-Towner Bill are, in our judgment, handing the teachers of the country poisoned fruit because for each dollar received from the Federal Government, five dollars will be held

back by the states and local authorities waiting for Uncle Sam to make the next move. . . .

"The National Education Association is performing great public service in crystallizing and making known to us the views of those engaged in public education. In its arguments urging Federal pay for teachers it is helping the American people to realize the sound public policy of more generous compensation for teachers in the public schools. In stressing the dangers of illiteracy, of the need of Americanization and making known to the American people the shortcomings of their school systems, they are helping to accelerate the constant forward march of our public schools.

"We admire the impatience of the teaching profession with the defects of our public schools, and we sympathize with their viewpoint that to get a quick remedy for some of these defects they desire to call the National Government to their aid. . . .

"In the 28 years from 1890 to 1918 local taxation for public schools increased from \$97,222,426 to \$580,619,460 or 498 per cent. In 1890, 67.9 per cent of the support of the public schools was paid by local taxation and 18.4 per cent by the state. In 1917 the figures were 78.8 per cent for local taxation and 13.7 per cent for the state, showing that contributions from local taxation have made the faster growth. . . .

"It should be noted also that many of the defects which we now recognize in our system of public education are defects of which we have become conscious only within the last few years. Some of the defects were not clear to the American people until the disclosures of the selective draft. Other defects have been disclosed only within recent years as improved methods of educational analysis have been available and as comprehensive surveys and intensive investigations have brought to light conditions which may have been familiar to specialists in education, but which were not known to people in general.

"It is further to be noted that within the last few years the science of education has developed far higher standards for education and that it is unfair to indict states and communities for failure to reach right away educational standards which have been raised markedly within a short time. . . .

"We find that the picture of the shortcomings of our educational

system is in many respects exaggerated, in other cases inadequately analyzed. We find great interest and great activity on the part of the states. The important question in considering the criticisms of our public school system that really have merit, such as the condition of the rural schools, inadequate compensation of school teachers, lack of preparation of teachers is to know whether we are making substantial progress on these difficult problems under the present system. Looking at the situation historically instead of by the 'shock' method, and discounting passing war conditions, we find that although we are still far from what we should attain, enormous progress has been made, especially in the past decade. We think it is clear that our present educational system has not failed and that there is no reason for scrapping it and no adequate reason for putting the Federal government into our public schools, or for appropriating today one hundred million dollars of Federal money. . . .

"Description of Sterling-Towner Bill.—The bill does not give evidence of careful analysis. No explanation has been offered by those who prepared the bill or those who advocated its passage before the Joint Committee as to how conclusions were arrived at either as to the amounts or the division of the appropriations. They are all good round figures and the total adds up to \$100,000,000, which is another good round figure. . . .

"The evidence irresistibly leads to the conclusion that the bill has not been framed with a view to doing the maximum for education. Statesmanlike educational policy is not there. The hand of the skilled politician is seen. The bill is constructed on well-known log-rolling principles. There is to be a piece of pie for everybody. The bill itself is a most unhappy augury of the sort of legislation that may be expected once we embark upon a policy of Federal participation. . . .

"Our review of the proposals for Federal participation in education and for the creation of a Department of Education has shown clearly the necessity for more comprehensive study and a deeper and sounder analysis of the educational problems of the nation, and one devoid of propaganda and the sensationalism which mark the present discussion. We believe it is desirable that there be substantial increase in the appropriation for the present Bureau of Education to make it possible for educational research to be conducted on a larger scale and for a

greater degree of leadership to be furnished to educational effort, especially in the more backward states. However, instead of increasing the appropriation of the bureau at one jump from \$162,000 to \$500,000 it will undoubtedly be more effective to make the increase gradually, and the increased appropriation should be based upon definite proposals for the expenditure of the money, which is one of the conspicuous defects of the proposal in the present bill for the appropriation of \$500,000 for the proposed Department of Education."

NEW STANDARDS OF COLLEGE WORK.—"The only object of entrance conditions should be to test whether students can do the college work. Very much of the red tape should be eliminated. Graduation is too long deferred. The only land in the world where so much time is spent on preliminaries is the United States. Further, tests of excellence are too low. None should be admitted to college work but those who really want intellectual training and are capable to taking it. None should be permitted to continue in it but those who take it well. Learning in homeopathic doses is not of great value. An institution of learning is primarily for those who want learning, without regard to sex, or race, or social status.

H. P. JUDSON in the *University Record*.

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE NATION.—"Let us take an inventory. Since the days of Darwin, university men and scientists outside of academic walls have gradually advanced the cause of knowledge, until today one of the fundamental sanctions of common men is thoroughly undermined. Few men now fear the anathemas of the clergy about the awful penalties of the life to come. The clergy that for a thousand years spoke with authority is losing its hold upon men. There has been no successor to Henry Ward Beecher, much as the country has needed another Beecher. The churches are agencies now of social betterment. They do not appeal strongly to men on the 'after life.' The preacher is a professional man like other professional men. He leads if he counts at all because of his character and the wisdom of his social methods. Science has robbed him of the divinity that once hedged him about. Science has taken away the mystery that once ruled so large a proportion of men. Thus millions of people have ceased to feel one of the great sanctions. Having

taken away so great a means of stabilizing society, does it not concern university men and scientists to return an equivalent?

"Of similar import is the fact that, during the three generations since William Lloyd Garrison's great agitation, the state has pretty nearly lost its grip upon society. In order to arouse men to the necessity of destroying the great economic wrong of slavery, the state was brought more and more into disrepute. The state had permitted itself to become the shield of slavery. The nation was likewise suffering from the same dangerous alliance with a great social wrong. But as the nation finally broke the hold of slavery upon its leaders, the nation came out of the agitation with high morale prestige. Lincoln's work and death democratized and hallowed the nation. But the prestige of the state was forever broken. . . .

"I have indicated two very serious developments of the last three generations of American history; the break-down of the sanction of the clergy, the church, the absence of all fear of the penalties of the life to come; and the break-down of the morale of the state, its social and its political inhibitions. Men no longer fear God nor tremble in the presence of the state. The preacher is just a man; the governor and the local judge are mere politicians. Reverence has gone. In part, this was inevitable. When science discovers truth and lays the foundation of vast social betterment, all men must be grateful, even if it undermines the faith of the masses. True men never fear the truth. In so far as this state of things is due to misconceptions of the proper methods of democracy, it has not been necessary. When men find that their political conceptions have failed, it is the business of education, both in institutions and in political organizations, to abandon false and set up real methods. Democracy can not long function when its leadership fails. The elaborate machine system is a negation of responsible leadership. It is a truism in our life that leadership has been failing with us now for thirty or forty years. There have hardly been great national leaders since Lincoln. Where both religious and political guidance fails, revolutions breed. France and Russia are the outstanding examples. Shall the United States invite such a catastrophe? That is the query I have hoped to have everyone contemplate this evening.

"If the American nation is to escape, the university must train men to a different public attitude. Three-fourths of our divinity students

realize their dilemma. Somehow they do not find a way forward. Three-fourths of our law students feel the hopelessness of the political situation, but they are not trained to be physicians to society. The vast majority of our undergraduates permit themselves to care more for grandstand football than they do for the fortunes of either state or nation. Yet the universities and the colleges receive perhaps hundreds of millions annually for the very purpose of training leaders for society. The fault is rather with the older than the younger generation. It is the failure of both higher and secondary education that gives occasion for uneasiness on the part of thoughtful men. With American society surely drifting into disorder, with politics stalled and deadlocked, there is no generation of enthusiastic young men to help us to sane reform. The national situation is distressing, public opinion is chaotic; and every economic group is seeking to help itself at the cost of us all. Under such pressure, the poor security the bosses give must soon fail.

"The country has drifted into this position. There has been little statesmanship until recent years. In order to exploit the national resources more rapidly, our fathers imported European labor in unprecedented numbers. Unlike earlier immigrants, the later ones settled in the cities. Their labor enabled American industry to become the greatest industry in the world. But, slowly and surely, the hordes of immigrants came to feel hostile, toward their employers and sometimes the country itself. Then another element became involved. The sons of farmers hastened to the growing cities. In order to better their lots and compete with 'foreigners,' they organized into unions. These unions soon came to think that their interest took precedence over all other interests. And labor, as it is called today, confronts employers with vast numbers, and demands what it can get. The result is great blocs of unassimilated population and far-flung organizations of workers. Labor fights for itself and against 'foreigners;' and the owners of capital, quite as well organized, fight for themselves. Nobody is for the public!

"At one time the country sought immigrants from all lands. It was only sufficient to be poor and helpless. America was the asylum of the oppressed for a hundred years. Now business men wish fresh supplies of labor, but they fear the ideas that new laborers may bring with them. Now labor unions bitterly oppose the importation of

fresh supplies of labor, lest their employers prove too strong for them. They wish no new competitors in the field of their activities. And the nation flounders, loath to close its doors so long wide open, loath to take in 'anarchists,' but afraid to exclude fresh labor. Democracy has grown afraid.

"The combination of industrial enterprise, vast resources, and the labor of a new and active population has given us an industrial power unmatched in all the world. The industrial output in 1920 was something like seventy billions' worth of goods. That is greater wealth than the world has ever known. The total property of Germany or France is hardly worth more than American industry creates in a single year. But the very existence of this vast wealth constitutes one of the greatest problem of all history. It might not have been a problem, if the plants of industry had originally been scattered all over the country, at waterfalls, near coal mines, wherever railroads could best be focused for general social purposes. But the people were not aware of the need for any such distribution until it was too late to distribute its social power. Business built the system to suit its immediate, not its ultimate, needs.

"The consequence is that we have built vast cities—built Paris, Berlins, and Londons—with all the risks, injustices, and unavoidable hardships of life in a great city. Our legislators knew Paris was the storm center of Europe, that the millions of poor people gathered there had long been the pawns of revolutions and reactions alike. They knew that Bismarck had built a similar storm center in Germany with his Hohenzollerns, his Prussian absentee junkers, his snobbish army officers, and his newly rich industrial masters. Few stop to think that this was one of the greatest causes of the Great War, this herding together of millions of men. With so much of fatal statesmanship before them, American law-makers and American business men reared their New Yorks and their Chicagos at places most convenient for them; and they still talk and plan even larger New Yorks and Chicagos.

"Nearly all the industrial wealth of the nation is concentrated in a narrow belt of city-covered land stretching from Boston to Minneapolis. So concentrated is this wealth that New York alone pays more income tax to the federal treasury than do all the states of the South. This fact is of itself a sore problem. The poorest and the

richest of the country are brought into close juxtaposition. The rich speak one tongue; the poor, in general, speak another. The rich have little enough wisdom to make vulgar display; the poor are so miserable they cannot avoid display; such stresses the American democracy was never intended to sustain. These displays and these contrasts are ever exaggerated. When there is work enough for all laboring men urge strikes; when there is too little work, employers resort to lockouts, in the hope of lowering high costs of production. In summer, working folk sometimes seem to be the happiest and the most reckless of men—the 'happiest mortals on earth,' as some would have us believe. In winter, long lines of hungry proletarians stand shivering in the cold, waiting their turns at the coffee counter. And this is free America. . . .

"And, outside the cities, there are the farmers. For a half a century they have been declining in relative, and even actual, strength. Today they are the minority of the nation. They grow the wheat of the country at a loss. The workers of the city eat bread at war prices. The farmer who owns his home has to sell it to pay taxes; the tenant who ought ever to plan to buy a home does not think of buying. The former owner of land is becoming a tenant. The tenant is becoming a day laborer. Vast tracts of farm land are falling into the hands of city-dwellers who have been able to gather from industry or trade the means to buy lands. Men who have stakes in the country decline in number every year. It is plainly a repetition of the awful evolution that took place in Italy during the third and second centuries before Christ. This appears a very pessimistic view. Let the optimist read the figures of the last census. There he will find the cause of agrarian unrest and decadence.

"But unrest does not usually bring remedies. The unrest of 1893-96 was great and ominous. It brought no solution. The lucky turn in the economic world saved the day for a time. And, later, the Great War set up a feverish prosperity only to plunge the farmer folk into still deeper despair. The old free farmer of the United States is disappearing; and thinking men seem not to concern themselves. Might not the universities seek to lend aid? Is it our business to remain contented with the policy of drift till all of us are pushed over the precipice?

"And, in the face of the city danger and the menace from the

land, men talk of disfranchisement. There is a growing feeling on the part of powerful men, especially among industrial leaders, that democracy is a failure. Very many of these leaders seek openly to disfranchise the city majorities, their own laborers, in the hope of retaining control of the national economic life. People think to unite country folk against city workers and thus retain their power undisturbed. A great American statesman once warned the country that the coming of great cities would be the end of American democracy. Our leaders, ignoring that warning, seek now to avoid the consequences by disfranchising great masses of people. It is proposed in the form of constitutional arrangements. Men's faith in constitutions is to be subjected to still another strain by giving city majorities minority representation in legislatures. And the plan, already in operation in Massachusetts, New York, Rhode Island, and Pennsylvania, is to be made effective by appeal to the age-old dislike of country folk for city folk! Is this wisdom? It is the Divide-and-Rule policy of Roman senators. . . .

"Shall the nation again make the mistake of fearing democracy? We are in a position to do so. Our vast cities are filled with workers whom many of us fear; and our workers are more and more coming to dislike, even hate, their employers. The nation has accumulated its greatest wealth in these cities where it may easily become the object of violent strife. Several of the industrial states have, as I have said, set up constitutions that limit the power of the majority. Manhood suffrage prevails, to be sure, but the fruits of manhood suffrage are denied. Our industrial states are free in outward form from industrial control, but, in fact, industrial control is apparent every day. What avails democracy if schemes and methods of popular restraint become the rule of life? Let us have faith; let us cast ourselves upon the ocean of public opinion; we shall be surprised how well we swim.

"Aside from the difficulties and the anxieties of the domestic situation, the foreign relations of the country are such that we are apt to have our electorates confused, and so intensify our problem, both from the point of view of democracy and from the point of view of national safety. In 1914, the nation and its citizens owed the rest of the world a sum so great that the interest has generally been estimated at five hundred millions a year. Before the Great

War was half over, all that indebtedness was paid in goods at war prices. Now, four years after the war, the nation and its citizens have loaned other peoples enough capital to yield more than a billion dollars a year. The people and the nation are thus the greatest creditor in the world, and the sum already loaned is increasing at the rate of a billion a year. That is a fearful fact. It is a reversal of rôle so sudden and so vast in its consequences that common folk have not become aware of the new state of things. They clamor for the payment of the interest and capital by Europeans who are too poor to feed their children. They demand payment in some cases as a matter of punishing hereditary enemies, for example, the Irish and German attitudes toward the English and French debts.

"There was another great change of rôles that came out of the war and the peace which followed. Hitherto, the nation had never been greatly concerned with international security. The people had never known what international fear meant. The war came; it taught them the meaning of Europe and the significance of war on a world-scale. For a time, all good Americans felt the imminent danger of German victory. At the peace, the United States was left secure. Few men were left with any sense of fear of any nation whatever. The German militarist plan had shown what could be done by that country. When Germany collapsed, there was no longer any power the United States feared. France, with its stationary population, could never attack the United States. England, dependent for its food and raw materials upon ocean traffic, could never make aggressive war upon the country. In fact, England has not in a century made aggressive war among great nations. Germany being subdued, there was security. That was a great gain. The people feel secure; they do not recognize the greatness of the boon. They cannot grasp, it seems, the reality of the fears of European peoples to whom the end of the war has not meant security. We think and vote as though we felt that other nations have only to say they are secure to be secure.

"The country occupies the very middle position of the modern world, a position like that of ancient Rome with the Mediterranean peoples about her; but no one knows it. The country holds the economic whip hand over the world; and yet our leaders in Congress talk about our being cheated out of hard earned savings; the United States is safe beyond all other peoples since the day of Augustus

Cæsar; and yet Congress is warned and the people frightened daily lest we be caught unprepared. Men begin to pick England for an enemy. We hear constantly of army and navy plans. With economic supremacy, with a position in the very middle of the world, what a terror we might be if there were any army and a navy, ready to fight at the 'drop of the hat!' And, with all Spanish America under willing or unwilling tutelage, what more should the country ask? Has Japan ever enjoyed such an advantage? Has any other people ever held so many of the great pawns of history? I think not.

"With a domestic position critical, with wealth concentrated and suspicion growing so that men wish to try Bismarck's plan of limiting popular representation, it does seem that the country needs to train men to think, take lessons in reality, and ponder what distrust of democracy means in our day. All the lessons of the recent war warn us; all the lessons of recent European history warn us; all the experience of American history says: 'Beware.'

"Since so many millions of men have lost their reverence for ancient religious sanctions; since clergymen and politicians alike have been dethroned, either by the discoveries of science or by the workings of democracy, there seems to me only one resource left for modern American Society. And that is the university. And with the university I associate the college and the whole army of teachers, high and low, throughout the nation. These constitute our hope. Yet how little have we taken thought of them.

"If there are some who think the university a place to prop the fortunes of men already secure, they are mistaken. If there are those who hope to make of the universities places where democracy is to be sneered out of existence, they have been grossly misled. The business of the university is to serve and secure all groups. The universities may not have waked up; the colleges may still be indulging in false hopes as to their privileged positions, where young folk in easy circumstances shall be made happy and comfortable; but they are false hopes. It is too late to try again the rôle of the universities of the Old South. The university is now, and must ever become more, the home of learning and science, a resort for able men who love research. It is now, or must soon be, free; free to think, to teach, and to write. Without that freedom there can be no university. Germany tried to bolster her imperialism by university support, by

guiding the thought of scholars and schoolmasters. Shall democratic America follow that example?

"If the universities rise to the new demands, they will supply us the new sort of preachers, the better sort of lawyers, and young graduates who care less for grandstand athletics and more for the rewards of public service. And they will fill the country with teachers and writers of truth, with women whom legislatures and the leaders of business will delight to reward with salaries commensurate with the greatness of the task to be performed. Why should the teacher of our children be skimmed in his living and crowded into poor, musty rooms for his residence? Who is worth more to society than he who instructs the men and women of tomorrow?"

WILLIAM E. DODD, in the *University Record*.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESSES

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY EDUCATION.—“These are some of the more conspicuous shortcomings of American university education. They strike the eye of any critical observer. But after all they represent only the superficial symptoms of a malady that is deep-seated. If we probe the situation further it becomes clear that the universities are not solely responsible for the defects that have been cited and that these defects cannot be entirely cured, although they may be remedied by the action of the universities alone. Indeed the responsibility can be rather evenly distributed over the whole educational system. It is therefore necessary to survey the whole problem before that part of it that concerns the universities only can be attacked. If I may be permitted a very dogmatic form of statement, the underlying factors of the problems can be summarized in a few sentences, thus:

“The period devoted to elementary education is too long. The materials presented to elementary school children are loosely organized, full of duplications and tiresome non-essentials. Methods have improved greatly in recent years, to be sure. But these advantages have been largely offset by the tendency to crowd all manner of subjects into the elementary school. Proof is wanting that the so-called enrichment of the elementary curriculum has increased the intellectual power of the pupils.

“Secondary education begins too late and ends too soon. It does not comprehend the whole period of general formal training which in most other civilized countries is assigned to secondary schools. It is too diffuse and consequently superficial. Incidentally it provides very imperfectly for the vocational preparation of those who must straightway proceed to earn a livelihood.

“University education is distinctly a hybrid phenomenon. The college of arts and sciences deals only to a limited extent with strictly university materials. At least 50 per cent of the work done in it ought properly to be classified as secondary education and rightly belongs to the secondary school. Because of this fact both the teaching methods of the college and its disciplinary regime are adapted rather to immature boys and girls than to men and women who have entered upon the serious preparation for their life work. Time is

therefore wasted not only below the college, but still more prodigally in the college. But university education also includes a group of professional schools and curricula operated on different levels. Some are on the level of the college of arts and sciences and take students direct from secondary schools. Others require for entrance one year of college training, others two years, and others four years. Thus the university itself endorses a paradox. Through the regulations governing its schools of medicine and law it implies that half of the college course is secondary education. Its schools of engineering and agriculture are administered on a contrary implication.

"If my analysis is correct it is clear that the United States faces the need of a drastic and thoroughgoing reform of its whole scheme of education to the end that our children and our youth may be more effectively trained and that time may be saved in the process. The reform demanded does not consist of the mere readjustment of the machinery of administration. It must go to the heart of the undertaking. It must deal with the content of subjects and courses. These must be definitely related to the future careers of the students who pursue them.

"It is always easy to find fault; and it is an ungrateful and an unpopular exercise. But we here have set about the task of building a university. In order that we may know how to build and what to build, it is necessary to have a look at the foundations. The defects that have been noted give no cause for discouragement. Rather are they a stimulus and a challenge. Their existence is the opportunity of the University of Buffalo. There is no central educational authority in the United States which can by fiat remold the whole system. If there were, perhaps the system would not be faulty in just the particulars that have been mentioned, but it would undoubtedly suffer from other and worse diseases. Changes in American education have to be made piecemeal. They result from local experimentation. If local experiments succeed they are adopted over wide areas and by contagion they become the rule of the land. Such being the case the University of Buffalo, just starting on a new cycle in its career, with fresh resources and a new college, is in a position to make an epochal contribution to American higher education. How?

"The emphasis in the foregoing discussion has been misplaced if it has not indicated that the center of the problem as far as higher

education is concerned is the college of arts and sciences. The college of arts and sciences must be regenerated or it will die. It will be cut up into a multitude of professional divisions and disappear. Three obvious steps suggest themselves as leading toward its regeneration.

"Admission to college and continuance in college should depend on a far more searching process of selection than any that now prevails. I do not hold with those who would limit the number of college students on the basis of any distinction of race or sex or creed or social standing. There is but one justifiable basis on which a university in a democratic community such as this can choose those who are to become members of it, the basis of ability. But a university is a place maintained at great expense to foster the philosophic point of view, to stimulate constructive thinking, because this point of view and this mode of thinking have been found necessary to the progress of civilized society. It is fair to demand that those who cannot capture the philosophic point of view and who cannot learn to think constructively should not consume its resources. Unfortunately we do not now have tests that will determine with sufficient accuracy the capacity of applicants for admission. The creation of such tests—and experiments in this direction are all the time going forward—is one of the important phases of the problem. The decision as to whether certain of those that are in college are qualified to remain is relatively easy. It can be made and made justly, if the moral courage of the faculty can stand the strain.

"As early as possible in the college course there should be provision of opportunities for independent study, carried on in the spirit of research, without meticulous oversight and with judgment only of the final results. This is substantially the procedure of the British universities with the selected group of students who read for honors. The work done by these students is incomparably superior in quality to that which any American college student is required to perform. A few American colleges are now experimenting with honor courses on the British model. But none of these experiments, as far as I am familiar with them, yet goes far enough. The principle which in the British universities applies only to honor students should be adopted by American colleges and applied universally. None should be allowed to graduate who have not demonstrated their capacity for

independent study and registered definite mastery of some field of knowledge. Not only would the American baccalaureate degree thus acquire a meaning which it now lacks, but the college of arts and sciences would become as serious and purposeful as are the professional divisions of the university.

"If the two steps that have just been described should be taken the instructional material of secondary grade which now encumbers the college of arts and sciences would largely disappear by force of gravity. Yet I believe that the college should also adopt other means to place secondary instruction where it properly belongs.

"By entering into the closest cooperation with the school systems from which the majority of its students come, methods of redistribution may be progressively established which will prove of mutual advantage to the college and to the schools.

"In the general problem of the reform of higher education the college of arts and sciences may offer the first point of attack. But I have failed in my analysis if I have not made it plain that professional schools also stand in need of reconstruction. There are two aspects of the problem as it concerns professional education. The various kinds of professional training must be re-examined with fresh reference to the demands of the professions themselves. And the chaos that prevails in the relationships of the college to the professional schools must shortly be reduced to some kind of order. I am persuaded that both these ends could be furthered by a type of educational research that has rarely been applied to higher institutions. There is a phrase that gained wide currency during the war. It may be offensive to chaste academic ears, but is very expressive. It is 'job analysis.' Now job analysis has recently been effectively employed to determine the content of courses of training for all kinds of artisans. Is it impertinent to propose that it would be very useful in the field of professional training also? If we could have a series of careful job analyses of the various professions, I venture to predict that they would be highly suggestive to those charged with professional education. Similarly, much of the confusion that now exists in the relation of the college to the professional schools could be cleared up by studies designed to reveal just what general information and what knowledge of special subjects are actually necessary for the several professional courses.

"Here are the bare outlines of a program that promises large results, if any institution will conscientiously adopt it. I cannot alone commit the University of Buffalo to this program. But I shall endeavor to convince my colleagues of the desirability of undertaking it. At the same time I do not forget that a university does not float in a vacuum. It is conditioned by its constituency. The needs of the constituency come first. I am not advocating a sudden revolution. I have attempted rather to specify the objectives of a long experiment.

"There are 586 colleges and universities in the United States. All are more or less committed to a single plan. Most of them are awed by agencies built up to enforce a mechanical standardization, restrained by traditions from embarking on new ventures. Has the University of Buffalo the courage to be different from the other 585? If my colleagues and the citizens of this community say 'yes,' a university may be developed here that will challenge nation-wide attention. Nothing could more surely establish the leadership of the University of Buffalo among the institutions of the land."

S. P. CAPEN, *Inaugural Address*, University of Buffalo.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS, BRYN MAWR.—"The college on her side is conscious of wise traditions and high purposes. She has been hard at work for two generations. The requirements she has made of herself are the result of experience and of thought. What must she add to them? What must she assume further as her duty to the public? If its demands be really just, the college should, indeed must, make these demands of herself.

"First of all, has not the community a right to require that the student of true ability who chooses to enter the college shall be given a fair chance to carry out her intention, that the barriers set up only to exclude the less well prepared in favor of the better prepared candidates shall be invariably surmountable by a straightforward and active intelligence plus diligence, that the path however narrow shall be straight, that there shall be no possible charge of a shibboleth of training administered by schools of a certain kind or special teachers who are in the secret?

"And again, every college must be a going concern, must pay its bills, but its policy should always be toward the lesser rather than the greater expense for the student. It is harder for the college adminis-

tration than for outsiders to know the sad loss which the college suffers in receiving only one type of student. Its tiny melting-pot is in the way of being an extraordinarily effective one. Within the small circle of college life, closeness of acquaintance, which in the intelligent person is the foundation for democracy, is especially possible. North and south, professional and artisan, rich and poor, rub unaccustomed elbows, and probably in no other four years of the lifetime of the individual is she open to such complete change in her attitude toward persons and beliefs or is she so stimulated by what she sees. Every intellectual exercise in the classroom, every discussion on the campus, shows the value of variety. The lack of it deepens and makes permanent all the old ignorances.

"Secondly, as the women's colleges have largely kept out of their curricula everything but the academic subject, their delightful wares, each summer's graduating class, are not always immediately ready for the market. Their students go through further training or apprentice years if they wish to practice the vocations or professions. But an immediate contribution if not of expert workers at least of expert work is nevertheless possible. Mr. Dewey has pointed out recently that before our knowledge will warrant our speaking of an art of education—an art we all hope to speak of before we die—we must expect to go through a complex process. With all available biological and psychological data in hand, as lamps unto our feet and lights unto our path, we must courageously make the experimental step which those data indicate. We must then watch the experiment intelligently and criticize it honestly. In that criticism, we may perhaps make a solid contribution however small to that future art of education. A college compactly organized to give an academic training can make a valuable contribution to the public in such experiments and in such discriminating criticism of the experiments once made. It is not enough to say that a woman's college cannot settle into a routine of method or curriculum; it should be willing to make its own method of teaching, the methods of learning which it imposes on its students now and again experiments in education, combinations of caution and daring. Again it should be ready to make constant new adaptations of academic work, such as the Training School for Social Work at Smith or the Summer School for Women Workers in Industry at Bryn Mawr. Again it should use all its own capacities; while giving its students the groundwork for

professional training, teaching, medicine, law, it should present to those choosing the profession and to all others the opportunity for contact with advanced academic work itself, with the scholar in his study, the scientist in his research laboratory. And it is especially the business of the women's college to keep in mind the profession of the teacher, to call out and encourage the student who shows that combination of intelligence and imagination necessary for the good teacher, and to see that she is directed into the proper preparation.

"The residence college sets arbitrarily its physical requirements for admission, it is able to regulate the food and exercise and it is equipped to watch the effect of the environment on its students. It should establish itself as an important ally in all study of public health and it should be required to contribute for the public its information on the health of young women. It is in a position to accumulate for its own use and for use outside, a body of facts relating to conditions among normal women which in completeness and accuracy can hardly be otherwise reached. The truth is that such a study, which to be valuable must be kept up to the minute, can be made only with an expenditure of time, money and intelligence that the women's colleges have not dared to volunteer nor the public to demand. Nor have they made sure that every student went out with the information about herself and about the conditions of health which would make it possible for her to keep herself fit to do hard work not only for a limited period but for a long working life.

"What advantages of training can the community demand for the young women whom it loans, not gives, to the college? Two, from the college requirements which are most criticized. If it is part of the traditional value of admission by some form of test that, in this way, a girl learns to face a period of intense mental and physical effort, meet it, go back to her routine and go through the same process again with less difficulty, then the community has a right to expect that a woman so trained will later on be better prepared mentally and physically to pass from an ordinary routine and to meet a crisis, and that she will use this hardly won power for the common benefit. Less nervous breakdown and more joyous attack on her work. Again where the student has been set to do intensive work in at least one subject, she may fairly be expected to have developed methods of work that will enable her to tackle problems of some complexity

whether she find them in her undergraduate Latin or later in an executive office, a political organization, or in ordinary community life. Her mind should be equipped to deal objectively with a matter and she should be prepared by instruction and by actual experience with some method of attack on a problem whose factors are at first unknown to her. The college which trained her believes she can do this more easily than the same student choosing a wide range of more elementary subjects. The life of the ordinary young American of the day differs from that of his parents chiefly in this—that he demands and has more variety, more acquaintance with a number of subjects. To stabilize this demand the American colleges should see to it that they offer not only the pleasure of opening a door into a new art or science but the companion pleasure of deeper penetration into the recesses of knowledge. The first man knew not wisdom perfectly; no more shall the last find her out, for her thoughts are broader than the sea and her counsels profounder than the great deep.

"And lastly, if for four years the student is to be often shut away from the busy human activities to which in the end she will return, the community has a right to ask not only that her intelligence should be trained but that in that important period her social imagination should not be dulled, that her sympathy should not be played upon and lessened but should be set on broad and strong foundations; that she learn respect for her own spirit and for the spirit of each individual she meets. They can demand that she come out to her life as a member of society with perceptions quickened, no sentimentalist, no moral bully, demanding and rejecting in accordance with her own standards alone. There is only one way to make sure this result. Within its narrow classrooms the college must see to it that she is taught with breadth of view, and this not only in so-called safe subjects, but in so-called dangerous subjects, in economics and history and psychology and religion; taught with sincerity which will call out sincerity in her; with imagination and breathing picture of the world she is to meet; and with liberty of spirit which will make her all through her life demand ceaselessly for herself and others the same quickening air. I have said that the community must demand this of the college; at the moment it is more often true that the college must create the demand."

MARION EDWARDS PARK,
in Bryn Mawr Alumnae Bulletin.

THE PURPOSES OF THE UNIVERSITY.—“But to talk about the purposes of the University, neglecting at the same time the means to attain the purposes, is futile. Our business is to know what we want and how to get what we want. Obviously the chief factor in the success of the University is good teaching. Let us consider here, then, two essentials of good teaching: First, scholarship and, second, close contact between the faculties of the University and the citizens of Pittsburgh and Western Pennsylvania.

“Scholarship.—Just what happens to students in the classroom and in other contact with teachers is difficult to say. But this much we know: If boys and girls are to find righteousness in the University, they must see and feel righteousness in those about them. Rules, demerits and precepts will never teach the lesson. Righteousness shines through from one life to another. Again, if boys and girls are to gain the power to think and the habit of constructive thought, they must gain this power and this habit not only from their own efforts, but also from the words, actions, and expressions of their instructors from the beginning of each class hour to the end. What the instructor laughs at and does not laugh at are quite as important as what he says. This statement is commonplace, but we forget.

“Great teaching is a process of illumination; it is stuff made of personality, character, scholarship, and professional training in the art of teaching. Much that is taught shines through from the inmost life of the teacher and inspires, enheartens, and grows in the life of the student. If we waken in a boy or girl a radiant mark of attainment, the industry and persistence of that boy or girl are usually won. And then if we throw the boy or girl into association with instructors who themselves have set out for the stars, their lives vibrant with righteousness, culture, scholarship, and disciplined thought, we have education at its top-most good. Here the sum of all possible good in teaching seems to be concentrated. It is intellectual and spiritual.

“But to get to the phase of the teacher’s proficiency which needs emphasis here: Success in teaching requires that the teacher have developed in him great sensitiveness, enthusiasm, and hard, matter-of-fact discipline in truth. Let me repeat hard, matter-of-fact discipline in truth, for upon that is needed the emphasis. Incidentally the living together of these three qualities in a single mind is a rare

coincidence, which fact goes far to explain why great teachers are few in number. But the fewness of great teachers is not the point now under consideration. The point is as to the value to the University of teachers who possess that high wisdom or scholarship which springs from training in exact thought; and the danger to the University of teachers who do not possess that quality.

"Solid training alone does not make a teacher. That is obvious. But the lack of solid training defeats a teacher's success. The results are these: First, the teacher untutored in exact thinking finds himself, at middle life or before, the product of confusion and of disappointment and becomes increasingly ineffective. Second, such a teacher, as mental confusion and disappointment grow into habit, becomes a detrimental influence among his colleagues. He gets in the way of the University's forward step. Third, shreds of facts patched together with wayward imagination are unsafe stuff in any classroom. Knowledge of what is and whole vision are a part of the University's pledge to its students. Nothing less will do. . . .

The principle here is this: The teachers in the University are a distinct social division of the community. They are a professional group. Their aims, however, affect the problems and needs of other social divisions in the community; that is, they train the young men and women who are to become the motive force in other social divisions such as law, medicine, engineering, and business. If the teachers are isolated from these other groups and especially from the groups into which their respective students are to go, if they do not exercise free unobstructed cooperation with these groups in the full swing of life, if they permit themselves to be hemmed round to the exclusion of all but their own specialization, then their work is bound to degenerate into impractical and fussy hastening to and fro. If the teacher's work is to be trusted, he must perceive in the active life about him outside of the University the problems which his fellows are endeavoring to solve. From this relationship he brings to his students then, wider application of his specialty, and fresh realization as to the worth of his instruction, both of which are an effective stimulus to his students. . . .

"To summarize briefly, free unobstructed contact between the University and the community makes for good teaching which, in turn, makes for the welfare of the community. Teachers should

avail themselves of every reasonable opportunity to grasp the problems and needs of the life about them, especially that life into which their respective students expect to go. On the other hand, no work outside of service to the University should be carried on by teachers if that work interferes with the thorough and effective performance of their duties."

JOHN G. BOWMAN, report as Chancellor
of the University of Pittsburgh.

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE COMMUNITY TO THE UNIVERSITY.—"Every university suffers from two types of competition—first, competition with other universities that are looking for recruits to fill vacancies, and, second, competition with the business world. It is not uncommon for business men to discourage young people from entering teaching. They take them upon the hilltops and point out the multitude of economic opportunities that lie in the valleys round about. They paint pictures of power, influence and wealth. The young student, filled with ambition and influenced by the pictures, resigns all thought of becoming a professor and enters the business world. Not only does the business world occasionally point out the wide array of economic opportunities which the young man will have, but in turn it is disposed to speak slightly of the salary of the professor. The business world alone is not responsible for this. Many of the professions are just as much addicted to it as men in manufacturing and mercantile life. Many of our doctors, lawyers and dentists frown upon the academic life and yet in the ultimate analysis progress in law, medicine, agriculture and in the various arts and sciences depends largely upon the research work done in institutions of learning. Just so long as men are drawn away from educational institutions in large numbers, just so long as public sentiment fails to accord to the researcher in educational institutions the credit to which he is clearly entitled, this drift will continue. . . .

"On the other hand, the community or citizens in the community should not make gifts to the university with the feeling that the university belongs to the community merely. Whenever a university becomes so localized in its efforts that it ministers merely to local needs, or what appears to be local needs, its educational functions are likely to be dissipated. Under such circumstances demands may

be made upon the university that are subversive to its very nature as an educational institution. This distinction should be kept clearly in mind. Otherwise the university will become the creature of private corporations and of individuals. No individual or corporation should assume that it has the right to insist that the university engage in a particular type of research for his or its special benefit. . . .

"What does a university stand for after all? What are its primary excuses for existence? What kind of ideals is it saturated with? A university stands for knowledge, for a search for the truth, for art, for better associations, for morality and for religion. It stands for the higher values of life. There was a time in the history of the human race when the values of life consisted largely of food, clothing, shelter and ornaments. The values of life in those days were essentially material in character. They could be handled, seen and exchanged. They had to do very largely with the necessities of life. They were concerned with things that were immediate and near at hand. Gradually these have been displaced with a new set of values that are more remote and indefinite, more intangible, but represent the finer things of life. The important questions which every community has to ask itself are: Does it wish to provide for more knowledge and for higher and finer types of works of art? Does it wish to encourage the search for truth in every field of human learning? Is it willing to lend its efforts for an improvement of the associations of life? Will it lay a better moral basis for the next generation, and will it insist upon higher religious ideals?

LOTUS D. COFFMAN, University of Minnesota,
in School and Society.

THE UNITY OF THE CURRICULUM.—"And here at last we come, I think, to the only important thing that can be said about the unity of the curriculum and our relation to it. The essential fact is that we, the college teachers, have no philosophy. We have been trained within the elective system. We are the devotees of 'subjects.' We live and think amid the fragments of an intellectual world which has been broken down. Ours is the task of building up again another view of life to hold the meanings which we had and have. And if we shirk that task in study and in teaching, no unifying courses will repair the damage. If teachers think in fragments, they cannot

teach in wholes. Devices of teaching technique will never remedy defects of thought. All that a teacher has to give is just his way of thinking about the world. And if we mean to give a liberal education, then we must be ourselves a group of liberally educated men. Out of the turmoil and confusion of this present time our minds must seek, are seeking order and meaning. And as we find it, our students will find it too. We do not teach so much by what we say as by the way we think. Our liberal colleges, teachers and students alike, have the task of finding and using a mode of thought by which an understanding of our life in all its phases may some day be achieved. Our urgent problem, whether in teaching or in study, is not to find devices which may remedy defects inherent in our usual ways of doing things. The problem is so to construe our task that we shall be about it in methods suited to it. We must not hesitate, dallying with 'subjects,' when the unity of knowing is before us as our goal. The time has come for vigorous and decisive action. It is a time of genuine testing of the American college and of its teachers."

ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN, Amherst College,
in the *New Republic*.

THE UNDERGRADUATE COURSE.—"But the real problem in undergraduate work today is the social status of the scholarly student. In numberless cases the spark of intellectuality is promptly stamped out by that tyrant of every campus—student tradition. A student who studies is queer! Few men or women have such devotion to inner promptings that they are willing to be accused of bad form. To be a highbrow is fatal to campus recognition. Every sane person is naturally highly sensitive to the judgment of his own colleagues. So long as students, either as a pose or actually, take the attitude that intellectual merit is not among the highest values of college life, we are not liable to accomplish much by our complicated organization of curricula or by the promulgation of epistemological theories. The issue is: Can it be brought about in American colleges that social prestige attaches to the man who achieves intellectual distinction? . . .

"Education is an inner affair. Multitudes imagine they want an education because they infer that thereby they will acquire sharper

implements for the economic struggle. University students in larger number treat their education just as they do a suit of clothes. It is an external thing. They can put it on or off as convention dictates. They want to *use* it without *being* it. The typical student dreads terribly the thought of being considered a highbrow or different from the man of the street. That education is to alter his tastes, deepen his sense of values, revise his standards, sharpen his appreciation of the truth, and quicken his sense of oughtness does not enhance its attractiveness. Education, even in the undergraduate world, tests as if by fire the very mettle of a man. It deals with his inner being. It commands him to put on, not as a garment, a new mind divested of all the ignorance, prejudice and superstition of earlier days and committed to the fearless quest of the truth regardless of the consequences to himself or his own personal interests. The spiritual necessities of education can only be supplied by our colleges and universities when in American homes, in business offices and in the political world some serious regard is paid to the things of the mind. Our undergraduate work today is the condemning reflection of the sense of values accepted by even the more prosperous, and possibly discriminating, class of American citizens who appear to believe in higher education."

M. L. BURTON, University of Michigan,
in the *New Republic*.

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF DEMOCRACY.—"It may be interesting to speculate concerning the effect of mental tests upon the problem of democracy. If the present hopes and expectations are realized they will result in a caste system as rigid as that of India, but on a rational and just basis. We are now examining children in the public schools, and find all ranges of intelligence from imbecility to genius. We are told that the intelligence quotient of a child rarely changes, so that we are enabled to tell early in his life what the limit of intelligence of any person will be, and in a general way to what class of vocation he is best fitted, and, to a certain extent, destined. When the tests for vocational guidance are completed and developed, each boy and girl in school will be assigned to the vocation for which he is fitted, and, presuming that the tests are really efficient, he will in the future not attempt any work too advanced for his ability and

hence make a failure of it, neither will he be found in an occupation too elementary for his ability and hence be dissatisfied. Economically nothing could be more desirable. All differences in accomplishments or results from that which the intelligence quotients would indicate would be due to certain traits of character which intelligence tests do not measure, *viz.*: industry, perseverance, thoroughness, honesty."

C. B. CUTTEN, Colgate University,
in School and Society.

JUNIOR COLLEGE MOVEMENT IN MISSOURI.—"...The accredited junior colleges are either coeducational or admit women only. Seven are coeducational and 11 for women only. . . .

"In 1920-21 the accredited junior colleges enrolled more than 3,000 students. Please note the significance of the figures. They mean that 3,000 of the youth of Missouri received in 1920-21 good instruction in two years of college work in accredited junior colleges; they mean that they received this instruction under conditions concerning libraries, laboratories, and faculties such as to make it possible for their work to be given credit in the University of Missouri and in other reputable institutions; they mean that these 3,000 students, mostly women, were enrolled in colleges that could give them such oversight, such personal supervision, and such individual attention as can be given by no large university; they mean that many of these students, perhaps one-third of the entire number, could pursue their studies under capable and stimulating teachers, and at the same time have the protection and the guidance of the home; they mean that the University of Missouri has been relieved of the care of some thousand or more freshmen and sophomores during a period of great economic pressure when such an increase in enrollment would have imposed a considerable burden upon the institution."

JOHN C. JONES, University of Missouri,
in School Life.

LOCAL AND CHAPTER NOTES

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, PRESIDENT AND PROVOST.—On December 27 the trustees made public the following resolutions:

Resolved, That in recognition of the great growth and development of the university and its activities, the need has become apparent for an executive and administrative head of the university, who shall have charge of the plans, policies and development of the corporate business, structural and financial interest and activities of the university and under whose direction the guidance and management of its executive and administrative duties generally shall fall. The trustees, therefore, create an executive and administrative office, to be designated "president of the university," which shall be the chief executive office of the university; and the committee on the revision of the statutes shall report to the board at its next meeting a revision of the statutes to carry out the provisions of this resolution;

Further resolved, That the office of provost as the "educational or academic" head of the University of Pennsylvania shall be continued. The provost shall have and discharge all of the powers, duties and functions heretofore vested in and devolved upon the provost, which shall not be vested in the president of the university pursuant to the foregoing resolution; that Dr. Josiah H. Penniman shall be elected to the office of provost in accordance with the statutes of the university;

Further resolved, That the manner and method to be followed in thus defining the duties of the executive officers of the university; the changes in the existing statutes necessitated by the creation of the office of president and the selection of a suitable person to fill such office of president, shall be referred to a special committee of five trustees to be appointed by the chairman of the board, of which the chairman of the board shall be *ex officio* a member, which committee shall confer with the sub-committee of the committee of one hundred of the General Alumni Society with reference to the selection of the president, and shall report to the board of trustees with all convenient speed. The chairman of the board, at his discretion, may add to the membership of said committee.

COMMITTEE NOTE

COMMITTEE G, on *Methods of Increasing the Intellectual Interest and Raising the Intellectual Standards of Undergraduates*.—The Committee is assembling a classified card bibliography, which now includes about four thousand references, on the several methods listed in its Survey of the Field of Work (printed in the *Bulletin* for February, 1922)—on an average, about sixty references per method. If any chapter or any member of the Association, or any other person, desires at any time a typewritten transcript of the references bearing on any particular method or on certain particular methods, and will pay the actual stenographic and postal expenses involved in making and sending the transcript, the Committee will be glad to furnish the transcript. Correspondence on this subject should be addressed to the Chairman of the Committee, Professor Ernest H. Wilkins, University of Chicago.

COMMITTEES FOR 1923

Executive Committee of the Council

Chairman, J. V. Denney (English), Ohio State

Edward Capps (Classics), Princeton; A. O. Lovejoy (Philos.), Johns Hopkins; W. B. Munro (Govern.), Harvard; W. T. Semple (Latin), Cincinnati; H. W. Tyler (Math.), Mass. Inst. Tech.; E. H. Wilkins (Rom. Lang.), Chicago.

Committee to Nominate Officers

Chairman, C. E. Mendenhall (Physics), Wisconsin

G. D. Hancock (Econ.), Washington and Lee; A. N. Holcombe (Govern.), Harvard; W. A. Nitze (Rom. Lang.), Chicago; L. J. Richardson (Latin), California.

STANDING COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE A

Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure

Chairman, H. F. Goodrich (Law), Michigan

C. M. Andrews (History), Yale; H. M. Bates (Law), Michigan; F. S. Deibler (Econ.), Northwestern; R. T. Ely (Econ.), Wisconsin; F. A. Fetter (Econ.), Princeton; F. H. Hodder (History), Kansas; J. P. Lichtenberger (Sociol.), Pennsylvania; F. R. Lillie (Zool.), Chicago; A. O. Lovejoy (Philos.), Johns Hopkins; D. O. McGovney (Law), Iowa; F. M. Padelford (Eng.), Washington (State); G. L. Roberts (Educ.), Purdue; U. G. Weatherly (Sociol.), Indiana; A. L. Wheeler (Latin), Bryn Mawr.

COMMITTEE F

Admission of Members

Chairman, Florence Bascom (Geol.), Bryn Mawr

J. Q. Dealey (Sociol.), Brown; A. R. Hohlfeld (German), Wisconsin; A. L. Keith (Latin), S. Dakota; G. H. Marx (Engin.), Stanford; F. A. Saunders (Physics), Harvard; F. C. Woodward (Law), Chicago.

COMMITTEE I

University Ethics

Chairman, J. H. Tufts (Philos.), Chicago

C. P. Costigan, Jr. (Law), California; John Dewey (Philos.), Columbia; W. B. Munro (Pol. Sci.), Harvard; E. A. Ross (Sociol.), Wisconsin; H. C. Warren (Psychol.), Princeton; U. G. Weatherly (Sociol.), Indiana.

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE B

Methods of Appointment and Promotion

Chairman, R. C. Flickinger (Greek), Northwestern

F. F. Abbott (Latin), Princeton; G. E. Barnett (Econ.), Johns Hopkins; J. S. Bassett (History), Smith; C. E. Bennett (Latin), Cornell; Percy Bordwell (Law), Iowa; J. M. Coulter (Botany), Chicago; Clive Day (Econ.), Yale; Max Farrand (History), Yale; J. F. Genung (Eng.), Amherst; R. L. Green (Math.), Stanford; E. E. Hale (Eng.), Union; W. E. McElfresh (Physics), Williams; T. H. Morgan (Zool.), Columbia; W. A. Noyes (Chem.), Illinois; J. E. Raycroft (Phys. Cult.), Princeton; R. M. Wenley (Philos.), Michigan; J. A. Woodburn (History), Indiana.

COMMITTEE D

Relation of Vocational to General Higher Education

Chairman, Lucile Eaves (Sociol.), Simmons

J. M. Brewer (Educ.), Harvard; E. F. Buchner (Educ.), Johns Hopkins; A. M. Cathcart (Law), Stanford; G. H. Chase (Archaeol.), Harvard; T. de Laguna (Philos.), Bryn Mawr; H. S. Fry (Chem.), Cincinnati; A. B. Hart (History), Harvard; H. H. Higbie (Engin.), Michigan; G. O. James (Astron.), Washington; A. H. Lloyd (Philos.), Michigan; W. F. Magie (Physics), Princeton; A. F. Payne (Educ.), Harvard; W. B. Pillsbury (Psychol.), Michigan; D. Snedden (Educ.), Columbia; F. C. Woodward (Law), Chicago.

COMMITTEE E

Extent of the Employment of Student Assistants and the Effect on
Quality of Undergraduate Instruction and on Graduate
Work of the Student Assistants*Chairman, L. L. Woodruff (Biol.), Yale*

H. Babson (Mod. Lang.), Purdue; Mary W. Calkins (Philos.), Wellesley; E. H. Cameron (Educ.), Illinois; B. M. Duggar (Botany), Washington (St. Louis); I. Hardesty (Anat.), Tulane; L. M. Hoskins (Engin.), Stanford; D. A. McCabe (Sociol.), Princeton; W. McPherson (Chem.), Ohio State; L. F. Mott (Eng.), City of New York; W. B. Munro (Government), Harvard; S. E. Stout (Latin), Indiana; C. H. Van Tyne (History), Michigan.

COMMITTEE G

Methods of Increasing the Intellectual Interest and Raising
the Intellectual Standards of Undergraduates*Chairman, E. H. Wilkins (Rom. Lang.), Chicago*

H. H. Bender (Philol.), Princeton; J. J. Coss (Philos.), Columbia; R. S. Crane (Eng.), Northwestern; Anna A. Cutler (Philos.), Smith; T. H. Dillon (Elec. Engin.), Mass. Inst. Tech.; C. M. Gayley (Eng.) California; G. R. Havens (Rom. Lang.), Ohio State; Olive C. Hazlett (Math.), Mount Holyoke; G. A. Miller (Math.), Illinois; W. J. Newlin (Philos.), Amherst; James I. Osborne (Eng.), Wabash; A. L. Owen (Span.), Kansas; Ralph B. Perry (Philos.), Harvard; R. K. Root (Eng.), Princeton; G. W. Stewart (Physics), Iowa; J. S. P. Tatlock (Eng.), Stanford; A. C. Trowbridge (Geol.), Iowa; A. E. Watson (Engin.), Brown; H. V. Wilson (Biol.), North Carolina.

COMMITTEE H

Desirability and Practicability of Increased Migration and
Interchange of Graduate Students*Chairman, A. O. Leuschner (Astron.), California*

F. W. Blackmar (History), Kansas; A. T. Clay (Philol.), Yale; J. H. Gray (Econ.), Carleton; E. R. Hedrick (Math.), Missouri; F. W. Kelsey (Latin), Michigan; A. W. Meyer (Anat.), Stanford; A. W. Small (Sociol.), Chicago; F. W. Taussig (Econ.), Harvard; J. W. Young (Math.), Dartmouth.

COMMITTEE J

Intercollegiate Athletics
(Awaiting Organization)

COMMITTEE K

Systems for Sabbatical Years

Chairman, Joseph Jastrow (Psychol.), Wisconsin

C. M. Andrews (History), Yale; O. J. Campbell (Eng.), Wisconsin; Margaret C. Ferguson (Botany), Wellesley; Tenney Frank (Latin), Johns Hopkins; J. W. Garner (Pol. Sci.), Illinois; A. C. Lanier (Engin.), Missouri; Ernest Merritt (Physics), Cornell; J. B. Pratt (Philos.), Williams; O. E. Randall (Mech.), Brown; F. N. Scott (Eng.), Michigan; R. M. Wenley (Philos.), Michigan; Frederick Slocum (Astron.), Wesleyan.

COMMITTEE L

Cooperation with Latin-American Universities to Promote Exchange
Professorships and Fellowships, etc.*Chairman, L. S. Rowe (Director-General, Pan-American Union), Washington*

S. I. Bailey (Astron.), Harvard; E. E. Brandon (Rom. Lang.), Miami; Philip M. Brown (Int. Law), Princeton; S. P. Capen*, Chancellor, University of Buffalo; A. C. Coolidge (History), Harvard; S. P. Duggan (Educ.), C. C. New York; A. C. Flick (History), Syracuse; J. D. M. Ford (Rom. Lang.), Harvard; Peter H. Goldsmith* (Director, Amer. Assoc. for International Conciliation), New York; E. C. Hills (Rom. Lang.), California; J. H. Hollander (Econ.), Hopkins; Wm. J. Hussey (Astron.), Michigan; Julius Klein,* Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.; C. C. Marden (Span.), Princeton; C. C. Plehn (Econ.), California; E. A. Ross (Sociol.), Wisconsin; Arthur R. Seymour (Rom. Lang.), Illinois; C. A. Smith (Eng.), U. S. Naval Academy; G. H. Stuart (Pol. Sci.), Wisconsin; Glen L. Swiggett* (Rom. Lang.), Washington, D. C.; Raymond Weeks (Rom. Lang.), Columbia.

* Associate members.

COMMITTEE M

Freedom of Teaching in Science

Chairman, J. V. Denney (English), Ohio State

G. A. Coe (Psychology), Columbia; E. G. Conklin (Biology), Princeton; John Dewey (Philosophy), Columbia; S. J. Holmes (Zoology), California; Vernon Kellogg, American Research Council; Shailer Mathews (Theology), Chicago; E. C. Moore (Theology), Harvard; Herbert Osborn (Zoology), Ohio State; W. Patten (Biology), Dartmouth; A. H. Turner (Zoology), Mt. Holyoke; H. E. Walter (Biology), Brown; W. H. Welch (Pathology), Johns Hopkins.

COMMITTEE N

Non-Academic Service

Chairman, M. B. Hammond (Econ.), Ohio State

(Membership Awaiting Appointment)

COMMITTEE P

Pensions and Insurance

Chairman, W. W. Cook (Law), Yale

S. S. Huebner (Finance), Pennsylvania; E. W. Kemmerer (Econ.), Princeton; W. F. Wilcox (Econ.), Cornell

COMMITTEE R

Encouragement of University Research

Chairman, W. A. Oldfather (Latin), Illinois

E. C. Armstrong (French), Princeton; C. Becker (History), Cornell; A. C. L. Brown (Celtic), Northwestern; A. R. Hohlfeld (German), Wisconsin; R. G. Kent (Comp. Philol.), Pennsylvania; E. P. Lewis (Physics), California; J. L. Lowes (Eng.), Harvard; W. A. Nitze (Rom. Lang.), Chicago; C. C. Torrey (Oriental Lang.), Yale.

COMMITTEE T

Place and Function of Faculties in University Government

Chairman, J. A. Leighton (Philos.), Ohio State

E. E. Hale (English), Union; T. Hough (Physiology), Virginia; O. K. McMurray (Jurisprudence), California; Marian P. Whitney (German), Vassar.

COMMITTEE V

Apparatus for Productive Scholarship

Chairman, F. J. Teggart (History), California

C. D. Buck (Sanskrit), Chicago; G. H. Chase (Archaeol.), Harvard; Clive Day (Econ.), Yale; J. A. Fairlie (Pol. Sci.), Illinois; Max Farrand (History), Yale; G. T. Flom (Scand. Lang.), Illinois; C. H. Grandgent (Rom. Lang.), Harvard; M. F. Guyer (Zool.), Wisconsin; G. L. Hamilton (French and Rom. Philol.), Cornell; E. R. Hedrick (Math.), Missouri; V. L. Kellogg (National Research Council), Washington, D. C.; C. Knapp (Latin), Columbia; B. E. Livingston (Botany), Hopkins; J. C. Merriam (Paleon.), Carnegie Institution, Washington, D. C.; D. R. Stuart (Greek), Princeton; F. Thilly (Philos.), Cornell; J. W. Tupper (Eng.), Lafayette; C. P. Wagner (Hisp. Lang.), Michigan.

COMMITTEE W

Status of Women in College and University Faculties

Chairman, A. Caswell Ellis (Educ.), Texas

Florence Bascom (Geol.), Bryn Mawr; Cora J. Beckwith (Zool.), Vassar; Harriet W. Bigelow (Astron.), Smith; H. E. Bolton (History), California; Isabelle Bronk (French), Swarthmore; Carleton Brown (Philol.), Bryn Mawr; Caroline Colvin (Latin), Maine; John Dewey (Philos.), Columbia; Anna J. McKeag (Educ.), Wellesley; D. C. Munro (History), Princeton; Helen M. Searles (Latin), Mt. Holyoke; Louise Stanley (Home Econ.), Missouri; Marian Talbot (Dean), Chicago; G. M. Whipple* (Education), Michigan; W. F. Willcox (Econ.), Cornell.

COMMITTEE Z

The Economic Condition of the Profession

Chairman (Awaiting Appointment)

C. C. Arbuthnot (Econ.), Western Reserve; T. N. Carver (Econ.), Harvard; W. W. Cook (Law), Yale; J. Jastrow (Semitic Lang.), Wisconsin; Amy L. Reed (Library), Vassar; W. T. Semple (Latin), Cincinnati; Alexander Silverman (Chem.), Pittsburgh.

* Associate member.

MEMBERSHIP

MEMBERS ELECTED

The Committee on Admissions announces the election of ninety-six members, as follows:

Boston University, W. A. Ault, E. M. Chamberlin, E. R. Groves, Guillermo Hall; Bowdoin College, H. C. Bell; University of Buffalo, W. V. Irons; Butler College, Katharine M. Graydon, R. A. Tallcott; University of Delaware, W. O. Sypherd; Denison University, W. A. Everhart, R. A. Sheets; University of Georgia, E. M. Coulter, L. L. Hendren, R. E. Park, R. P. Stephens; Georgetown College, D. E. Fogle; George Washington University, H. G. Spaulding; Goucher College, Ola E. Winslow; Iowa State College, C. L. Benner, C. J. Drake, L. H. Willson; University of Iowa, E. W. Chittenden, F. H. Randall; Hamline University, M. L. Wright; University of Kentucky, Harry Best, W. D. Funkhouser, S. E. Leland, E. S. Perry; Kenyon College, J. B. McKinney, E. H. Young; Lafayette College, W. C. Beaver, John Carruthers, R. S. Illingworth, L. Z. Lerando, W. B. Marquard; University of Maine, A. M. Turner, H. F. Watson; University of Michigan, W. P. Calhoun, C. E. Griffin, W. A. Paton, H. N. Schmitt; Middlebury College, C. F. Abbott, W. G. Kleinspehn, L. R. Perkins, P. G. Perrin; University of Nebraska, Emma N. Andersen, R. S. Boots, G. R. Chatburn, Lida B. Earhart, Margaret Fedde, R. A. Lyman, P. K. Slaymaker, C. W. Taylor, H. H. Waite; Northwestern University, A. R. Nykl, K. K. Smith; Pennsylvania State College, H. H. Geist, C. E. Myers, A. L. Rhoton; North Carolina College for Women, J. P. Givler; University of Pittsburgh, O. H. Blackwood, G. J. Rich, John Valente; University of Rochester, William Berry, Charles Carron, Edwin Fauver, Elliott Frost, J. P. King, R. A. MacLean; Rose Polytechnic Institute, C. P. Sousley; Rutgers College, Ernest Little, J. H. Logan; University of Southern California, R. L. Power; University of Tennessee, Z. B. Wallin; Trinity College (Conn.), F. J. Burkett, J. A. Spaulding; Trinity College (N. C.), E. W. Edwards, A. H. Gilbert, C. A. Krummel; Wabash College, G. E. Carscallen; Washington University, F. W. Bubb, C. W. Everett, Eugene Stephens; University of Washington, S. H. Ander-

son; Wesleyan University, P. H. Curts, W. G. Foye, P. L. Given, George Humphrey, Oscar Kuhns, W. J. Wilkinson, W. C. Woods; Worcester Polytechnic Institute, G. H. Brown; Wittenberg College, P. H. Heisey; Yale University, C. L. Deming, E. A. Park, G. F. Powers.

NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following forty-nine nominations are printed as provided under Article IV of the Constitution. Objection to any nominee may be addressed to the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Cambridge, Mass., or to the Chairman of the Committee on Admissions¹ and will be considered by the Committee if received before May 1, 1923.

The Committee on Admissions consists of Florence Bascom² (Bryn Mawr), Chairman, J. Q. Dealey (Brown), A. R. Hohlfeld (Wisconsin), A. L. Keith (South Dakota), G. H. Marx (Stanford), F. A. Saunders (Harvard), and F. C. Woodward (Chicago).

Esther Anderson (Geography), Nebraska

Cella Bourne (Latin and Greek), Mills

O. F. Bouche (Economics), Pennsylvania State

Edward S. Burgess (Biology), Hunter

Martha G. Castor (Biblical History), Mills

Edwin M. Chamberlin (Psychology), Boston

Letta M. Clark (English), Nebraska

Flora C. Cook (Music), Redlands

W. T. Darby (English), Redlands

Roy Davis (English), Boston

Robert W. Dickey (Electrical Engineering), Washington and Lee

Thomas L. Easterling (Economics), Boston

Willard Farnham (English), Washington and Lee

Edward A. Fath (Astronomy), Carleton

Thomas W. Fitzgerald (Electrical Engineering), Georgia Technology

Wesley M. Gewehr (History), Denison

Minnie A. Graham (Chemistry), Mills

D. F. Grass (Business Administration), Grinnell

Beulah L. Hanley (English), Lake Erie

¹ Nominations should in all cases be presented through the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, 222 Charles River Road, Cambridge, Mass.

² Present address: U. S. Geological Survey, Washington, D. C.

Joanna M. Hansen (Home Economics), Iowa State
Charles Buell Hurd (Chemistry), Trinity
Fernand Jagu (Modern Languages), Union
C. W. Knapp (Biology), McKendrec
Robert H. Loomis (Economics), Boston
William T. Lyle (Engineering), Washington and Lee
Charles H. Marsh (Music), Redlands
Thomas Matthews (Electrical Engineering), North Dakota
John Richardson Miller (Romance Languages), West Virginia
R. H. Perring (German), Grinnell
Adeline Reynoldson (History), Nebraska
C. L. Rich (Economics), Dakota Wesleyan
Elizabeth Rothermel (Home Economics), Mills
R. L. Sackett (Engineering), Pennsylvania State
C. C. Schmidt (Education), North Dakota
Lurene Seymour (Household Arts), Mills
John G. Sinclair (Anatomy), North Dakota
Arthur Dodd Snyder (Mathematics), Union
J. W. Sprowls (Education), Tennessee
Charles M. Strong (Economics), Boston
John Donald Wade (English), Georgia
Ona Wagner (History), Nebraska
Roosevelt Pruyn Walker (English), Georgia
Morris Wenk (Mechanical Engineering), Oregon Agricultural
William Oswald Weyforth (Economics), Johns Hopkins
Norman Richard Wilson (Mathematics), Manitoba
Benjamin Allen Wooten (Physics), Washington and Lee
Harry C. York (Sociology), Hood
Donnell Brooks Young (Biology), Carleton
R. T. Young (Zoology), North Dakota